

FINANCE DEPARTMENT

CORRIGENDUM

The 23rd March, 1968

The word "Treasurers" shall be substituted for the word "Treasuries" in the nomenclature "Haryana

Treasuries Organisation (State Service Class III)" appearing at Sr. No. (vii) in the Finance Department Notification No. 75-1A-HR(17-41-10)-68 2180, dated the 27th February, 1968, published in the *Haryana Government Gazette*, dated the 12th March, 1968.

J. R. DHINGRA, Dy. Secy.

LABOUR DEPARTMENT

The 29th March, 1968

No. 2858-3-Lab-68/8442.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the President of India is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and management of M/s Suchet Singh and Sons, Railway Contractor, Rewari : -

BEFORE SHRI P. N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 109 of 1967

*between*SHRI LALA RAM WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S SUCHET SINGH LAND SONS,
RAILWAY CONTRACTOR, REWARI*Present---*

Shri C. B. Kaushik, for the workman.

Nemo, for the management.

A W A R D

The claimant Shri Lala Ram was serving as a Vender under M/s Suchet Singh and Sons, Railway Contractor, Rewari. It is alleged that his services were dispensed with on 19th July, 1967. This gave rise to an industrial dispute. The President of India in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 read with proviso to that sub-section of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute,—*vide* Gazette Notification No. 556-SF-III-Lab-67, dated 28th November, 1967, for adjudication :—

Whether the termination of services of Sh. Lala Ram was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the reference usual notices were issued to the parties in response to which the claimant filed his statement of claims. On behalf of the management Shri K. S. Rawit appeared but he did not file any written statement. An opportunity was given to him to file his written statement on payment of costs. On the adjourned date one Shri Khushal Singh appeared on behalf of the management and filed a written statement but did not pay the costs. The case was adjourned specifically at the request of the management and this adjournment was allowed on payment of costs which were additional and since the management did not pay the costs, the claimant was directed to produce *ex-parte* evidence in support of his case. Thereafter the management did not appear and the *ex-parte* evidence of the claimant was recorded.

The claimant has appeared as his own witness in support of his case. He has stated that he served the respondent concern for about 11 or 12 years and his services were terminated on 19th July, 1967. The claimant has explained that his salary was in arrear for two months and when he asked for his pay he was told to collect it on 19th July, 1967 and when he asked for his pay on 19th July, 1967 he was told to go away and not to come for work again. The claimant says that he made a complaint to the Labour Inspector, Gurgaon regarding the manner in which his services were wrongfully terminated. Copy of this complaint is Ex. W. 1. There is no reason to disbelieve the testimony of the claimant. In my opinion he is entitled to be reinstated with continuity of service and full back wages and I give my award accordingly.

P. N. THUKRAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak

Dated the 19th March, 1968.

No. 506, dated the 25th March, 1968.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

P. N. THUKRAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

The 19th March, 1968.